ACTIVE CASES
Analysis February 2004 QA Results for Food Stamps

Sample Size: 83
          (drops excluded)

Totals for February 2004:

LOCATION	TOTAL SAMPLE ISSUANCE	# of ERROR CASES	ERROR DOLLAR TOTAL	PERCENT DOLLARS IN ERROR	FFY 2004 ERROR RATE
STATEWIDE	14,058.00	11	859.00	6.1%	7.2%
MILWAUKEE	6,892.00	6	684.00	9.9%	10.9%
BAL- STATE	7,166.00	5	202.00	2.4%	4.3%

ERROR CAUSES BY TYPE:
- **4-** Agency Preventable Errors
- **5-** Client Errors
- **1-** CARES-dropped a person from FS group

OVERVIEW OF THE ERRORS AND WHERE THEY OCCURRED:
Of the 4 APES, two were in Milwaukee, and two in balance of state.   Two cases which were considered client errors also had APES (but not recorded as such since each caused less than half the dollars in error)

Of the 5 client errors, three were in Milwaukee .

TYPES OF APE ERRORS (4 total plus two which were contributing errors as explained above):

1- **Institution**: failed to record household's new living arrangement as a type not eligible for FS

2- **Child Support Expense:** agency budgeted CS expense paid for child in the FS group; two other errors were failure to check KIDS and budget Child Support (these were both in cases that had larger client non-reporting errors but they contributed to the overall dollar error and rate)

1- **Utilities**: failed to budget a heat expense known to the agency

1- **Earned Income:** failed to budget known earned for application month.

TYPES OF CLIENT ERRORS (5 total):

1- **Assets**: client failed to report assets at application that were over program limits

2- **Household Composition-**client failed to report persons in the home who had to be included in the FS group

1- **Rent:** client failed to report correct rent share

1- **Earnings:** client failed to report regular incentive pay

WHEN WERE THE APES MADE?

Of the 4 APES, 1 was made at re-certification, and 2 were at application, and one was at a reported change.

TRENDS OR RECOMMENDATIONS?

- **Location:** The four APES were distributed around the state.
-
- **Client errors:** A large proportion of the errors were due to client failure to report correct information at application or review.   Better investigative interviewing skills can reduce the possibility of these. Some customers make assumptions about who has to be reported as living in the home and
- who doesn't; more time spent on discussing this with the customer is needed. Checking CARES for companion cases can reduce errors in shared rent budgeted.
  (As for the client asset reporting error, it will no longer affect FS accuracy because of categorical eligibility, but since many cases are also Medicaid, Childcare and/or W2, questioning these balances and requiring proof when the client is vague or uncertain when making self-declaration statements of value will mean more accuracy in those programs.)
-
- **"BIGGEST CONTRIBUTORS": The cases that caused the largest dollar errors for January 2004 (including client errors):**

- **Milwaukee County, $267 Client Error**: The customer failed to report her mother lives with her. Since the customer is under age 22 she has to include her mother in her FS group. The mother's income along with some Child Support reduced this group's FS benefits to zero. A smaller part of the error was agency error for not checking KIDS, since there was consistent CS income which did not get budgeted.

- **Milwaukee County, $122 Client Error:** The customer failed to report that her grandson has lived with her since birth. The child's SSI income reduced the eligible FS benefit.

- **Milwaukee County, $112 Agency Preventable Error:** The agency failed to budget known earned income for the sample month. The error possibly evolved this way: the customer requested FS in February. She was already open for other programs so the worker had it in review mode. When the verification for the job came in on Feb 19th the worker entered it as starting March 1, thinking it was for review purposes, and not affecting the current month. Consequently no income for the application month of February was counted.

- mbw 06/24/04